Applicant(s) Application 08/482,933 NORTHRUP ET AL. Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner 1631 Ardin Marschel All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Ardin Marschel(Exr.). (3)_____. (4)____. (2) Michael Tuscan (Rep. in Office of Paul Kokulis). Date of Interview: 27 May 2003. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: . Claim(s) discussed: all pending in general. Identification of prior art discussed: N/A. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) \square was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Tuscan as informed that the suspension of the instant application will be withdrawn via an Office action to be mailed from the USPTO shortly to resolve preliminaries to an Interference proceeding as requested by applicants... (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required